

**Proposed Accreditation Handbook Language
Regarding Revisits
April 2012**

Overview of this Report

This item is a result of the discussion at the March COA meeting regarding the development of a chapter for the *Accreditation Handbook* that provides direction to approved institutions, team lead and team members, and staff consultants in preparing for and completing an accreditation revisit. The new chapter will also provide information from the Committee on Accreditation that clarifies the procedures for a revisit.

Staff Recommendation

This is an action item and staff recommends the COA approve the new chapter for the *Accreditation Handbook* related to revisits.

Background

The COA discussed a draft of this item at its March 2012 COA meeting. Comments from members of the Commission have been incorporated into this version of the document. One of the suggestions made by Committee members was to include in this agenda item a copy of a report template. A copy of the report template is provided here as Appendix A. The COA members may also like to review the format and content for several recent revisit reports. The Masters College revisit report can be accessed at <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2012-04/2012-04-item-10.pdf>. The National Hispanic University revisit report may be accessed at:

https://info.ctc.ca.gov/fmi/xsl/cnt/NHU-FINAL.pdf?-db=PSD_Program_Sponsors_DB&-lay=web_Accreditation_Reports&-recid=55&-field=COA_Report_Site_2nd_Revisit.

The following is the proposed content of this chapter:

What is an Accreditation Revisit?

A *revisit* is an accreditation visit that is conducted as a result of action taken by the COA to ensure that the institution has fully addressed the stipulations placed upon it by the COA. The purpose of a revisit is to allow an approved institution with stipulations following an accreditation site visit the opportunity to demonstrate to a review team that it has modified its practices such that the revisit team can find the standard or standards applicable to the stipulations that were less than fully met to now be met, and as a result, to recommend to the COA the removal of those stipulations. An institution revisit must occur during the year following the initial accreditation site visit. A revisit will be conducted only if COA has indicated a revisit is necessary.

The initial site visit team is required to come to standard findings for each Common Standard and program standard and to recommend an accreditation status to the COA. Sometimes, the team identifies one or more elements of a standard that are not met while

the rest of the standard is met. Depending on the centrality of that element to providing strong preparation to educators, the standard can be found to be Met, Met with Concerns, or Not Met. Once the standards findings are decided, the team is guided by the table in Accreditation Handbook Chapter Nine to develop an accreditation recommendation and, if appropriate, draft stipulations. The stipulations might include the recommendation that quarterly progress reports, a report after one year, or a revisit is appropriate. If there are significant standard findings that prevent the COA from granting accreditation to the institution, the actions that must be taken by the institution are identified as stipulations. Stipulations describe the specific actions that will remove a finding that prevents the institution from gaining full accreditation.

Who Participates in the Revisit?

If the COA has taken action that includes stipulations and that a revisit should take place within one year of its action, generally, the team lead from the initial visit and the CTC consultant will be the team members who return for the revisit. However, the size and composition of the team will depend upon the number of findings and breadth of programs impacted. If appropriate, the size of the team that returns to the institution may be larger than the simply team lead and consultant. If not explicit in the COA action, the determination of the number of reviewers for any given site visit will be made by the Administrator of Accreditation. The Administrator of Accreditation may consult with the team lead and will make that determination based on the number and nature of the stipulations to be addressed. The Administrator of Accreditation may determine that a different team lead and/or consultant should serve as the team lead and/or consultant for the revisit. Unlike during initial site visits when the CTC consultant plays a facilitative role, during revisits the consultant may participate(s) in interviews, document reviews, and discussions that lead to standards findings and to an accreditation recommendation. If additional reviewers are used beyond the team lead, these individuals should be BIR trained. For Joint NCATE/CTC revisits, NCATE typically sends new reviews, while the CTC team lead and consultants are usually the same as with the initial visit.

Who Makes Preparations for the Revisit?

As with the initial site visit, the CTC consultant is responsible for working with the institution on the logistics of the revisit. The institution is responsible for logistics for the visit such as identifying the hotel, ensuring transportation for the team, arranging for meals, obtaining a team meeting room, and developing an interview schedule. However, unlike initial site visits, there is no contract developed for the hotel and meals costs which means that revisit team members pay out of pocket for meals and lodging, and then request that those costs be reimbursed.

What Preparations Are Required?

Unlike the initial accreditation site visit, there are no program assessment findings, biennial reports, or program summaries to guide the revisit team. Rather, the revisit is focused on the accreditation determination, stipulations placed on the institution by the COA and the accreditation decision letter sent to the institution.

During the year between the COA's original decision and the revisit, the institution takes action to address the concerns raised in the report and by the COA. In preparing for the revisit, the institution is guided by the consultant to focus its responses on addressing the submitted documentation and evidence which focuses on issues identified by the initial site visit team. On occasion, the institution may be required to prepare quarterly progress reports that are submitted to the consultant and the COA. In addition, when a revisit is required, the institution must prepare a document that describes, issue by issue, the steps the institution has taken to ameliorate concerns identified by the initial team's findings that it believes address the findings and stipulations. The COA's actions define the scope of the visit and who should be interviewed by the revisit team. For all site visits, the interview schedule forms the backbone of the visit. For revisits, only individuals who can specifically address changes the institution has made in response to the stipulations are included in the interview schedule. Similarly, only documentation and evidence that clarifies how the institution has addressed the stipulations is reviewed during the visit. The institution prepares documents and provides evidence that address specifically each stipulation the COA placed on the institution, and the standards aligned with those stipulations, as well as those standards not found to be fully met. Consequently, a revisit is shorter than the initial site visit and sometimes lasts only 1 ½ to 2 days.

What is the focus of the Revisit

It cannot be overstated that the intent of a revisit is to focus on the stipulations placed on the institution. This includes the standard elements (Common or Program Standards) found to be less than fully met during the initial accreditation site visit that are *related to the stipulations*. Stipulations generally describe the activity or activities the institution must complete in order to meet the standard(s) that had prevented the institution from gaining full accreditation. The stipulations guide the institution in its remediations and the team in examining and weighing the evidence. The standard of evidence for a revisit is the same as that for an initial site visit. Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR) are trained to recognize the evidence sufficient to document that an institution is meeting a standard.

The relationship between Stipulations and Standards Decisions in Revisits

It is important to emphasize that the focus of the visit is to ensure that all stipulations have been addressed. In doing so, standards decisions related to the stipulations should be determined by the revisit team. However, standards not related to the stipulations do not necessarily need to be addressed at the time of the revisit. It is advisable that the institution address them but it is not a requirement for removal of stipulations. The team lead and consultant should clarify this with the institution prior to the site visit.

What is the Outcome of a Revisit?

At multiple times during the revisit, the team members will share their observations and concerns with the institution. During the revisit, the team members develop a consensus document of findings on the stipulations and the standards applicable to the stipulations

which were not fully met in the initial site visit. Finally, the revisit team will agree on an accreditation recommendation to present to the COA. (See Appendix A for a Revisit Report Template). At times, the team finds that not all issues from the initial visit have been sufficiently addressed. In those cases, the team can recommend a decision of Accreditation with Stipulations and identify another set of draft stipulations for the COA's consideration.

If the revisit team finds that the situation has either deteriorated or that the institution has made no progress, it may recommend a more serious accreditation recommendation, including Denial of Accreditation.

Removal of Stipulations and Further Action

If the COA determines that stipulations should be removed, it may also determine whether there is any specific follow up necessary after removal of stipulations. For instance, the COA may require that the institution report on the progress of addressing one or more of the areas identified in the stipulations in their next regularly scheduled biennial report to ensure the corrective action or improvements are maintained over time.

Next Steps

If the COA acts to adopt the language related to revisits, staff will incorporate the language into the *Accreditation Handbook* and post that new chapter on the webpage.

Appendix A

Recommendation for Change of Accreditation Status for Institution Name Month Year

Overview of this Report

This agenda item is a follow-up of the accreditation visit to <Institution Name> that was conducted <Insert date of original visit, Month Year > A revisit took place in. <Insert date of revisit visit, Month Year > This item provides the report of the revisit and recommendations regarding the stipulations and the accreditation status for <Institution Name>.

Background

In <Insert date of original visit, Month Year >, a site visit team recommended that the COA grant **Accreditation with Stipulations** to <Institution Name>. The institution was required to respond to the stipulations and prepare for a revisit within one year of the accreditation action. <Institution Name>. prepared an interview schedule for the constituencies identified by the team. The revisit was conducted by the original team lead and CTC staff consultant. After the interviews on campus, the team prepared an accreditation report to present to the COA for consideration and action.

Stipulations from the <Year> Accreditation Visit and the <Year> Revisit Team Recommendation

Stipulations from the <Year> Visit	<Year> Revisit Team Recommendation
1. That <Insert stipulation language>	Removal of Stipulation
2. That ... <Insert stipulation language>	Removal of Stipulation

Report of the Accreditation Re-Visit to
Institution Name
Month Year

Institution:

Dates of Revisit:

**Prior COA
Accreditation Decision:**

**Accreditation Re-Visit
Team Recommendation:**

The team recommends that:

1. The stipulations from the <Year> accreditation visit be <removed/retained>.
2. The accreditation decision be changed from <Provide recommendation> to <Provide recommendation>.

Rationale:

The recommendation of **Accreditation** was based upon the institutional response to the stipulations and a thorough review of the <list areas of concern> The team felt that it obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the professional education unit's operation.

Below are listed the stipulations approved by the COA after the site visit in <Year> followed by the <Year> institutional response. Next are listed the revisit team findings and recommendations. After this section, the revisit team findings on the Common Standards and Program Standards are included. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

Common Standards

The team reviewed the ... Common Standards that were less than fully met and found are now <Met/Not Met/Met with Concerns>

Program Standards

The team reviewed the <List programs> Standards that were less than fully met and found that <List standard numbers> are now <Met/Not Met/Met with Concerns>

Follow-up Revisit Team Findings <Revise as necessary>

Based upon constituent interviews and review of documentary evidence the follow up revisit team found that <Institution> has provided evidence that all Common and Program Standards are now <Met/Not Met/Met with Concerns>. On the basis of these recommendations, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following credentials:

Initial/Teaching Credentials

<Provide titles of approved credentials>

Accreditation Team

Team Leader:

<Name/Institution>

Staff to the Visit:

<Name/Position>

Documents Reviewed

<Revise as necessary>

Institutional Self Study
WASC Assessment Report for Education
Four Pillars Bibliography
Four Pillars Assessment Matrix
School Description and Demographics Form
2012 Summer Faculty Research Agenda

Course Syllabi
CAC Advisory Committee Agendas and Minutes
TPA Student Report Forms
Faculty Dossier
Candidate Placement Tracking Matrix

Interviews Conducted

<Revise as necessary>

	Total
Program Faculty	
Institutional Administration	
TPA Coordinator	
Candidates	
Advisory Board Members	
Supervising Practitioners	
School Administrators	
Field Placement Coordinator	
Total	

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one cluster (especially faculty) because of multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.

Program Review Status

<Revise as necessary>

Program Name	Number of program completers (<Year>)	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted	Agency or Association Reviewing Programs

The Follow-Up Revisit (<Year>)

The follow-up revisit began on . <Insert date of revisit visit, Month Year > with the Team Lead and Commission staff consultant. . <Insert information about the visit >

Findings on Stipulations

Stipulation #1

<Language of stipulation>

Institutional Response 2012

To address this stipulation <Institution> the institution took the following actions:

- <Describe actions>

Revisit Team Finding

Upon a thorough review of institutional program documents <list other sources of information> the team found convincing evidence that the institution has taken appropriate steps to address this stipulation.

Revisit Team Recommendation

Revisit team recommends removal of the stipulation.

<Repeat as necessary>

Common Standards

Findings on the Common Standards <Year>

During the <Institution> accreditation visit, the accreditation team made findings related to the <Insert number> Common Standards that were less than fully met. A summary of the <Year> visit findings is presented in the left-hand column below. The <Year> Revisit Team findings are presented in the right-hand column.

<Year> Visit Findings	<Year> Revisit Findings
Common Standard <Standard number>	
Not Met:	Met:

Program Standards

Findings on the Program Standards <Year>

During the <Year> visit, the team found that <Number> Program Standards were <Provide standard decision>. After review of the institutional self-study <list other sources of information> the revisit team determined that <Number> of the <Name of program> program standards are <Insert Met/Met with Concerns/Not Met>. A summary of the <Year> visit and <Year> revisit findings is provided below.

<Year> Visit Findings	<Year> Revisit Findings
<Name of program> Program Standard <Standard number>	
<Standard Decision>:	Met: